



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,750	07/03/2001	James G. Wetmur	Enz-49(P2) (C)	7451
28171	7590	02/06/2008	EXAMINER	
ENZO BIOCHEM, INC. 527 MADISON AVENUE (9TH FLOOR) NEW YORK, NY 10022			LU, FRANK WEI MIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1634	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/898,750	WETMUR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Frank W Lu	1634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 117-180 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 126,133,138,139,142,143 and 149-178 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 117-125,127-132,134-137,140,141,144-148,179 and 180 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***CONTINUED EXAMINATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.114 AFTER FINAL REJECTION***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission of RCE and the amendment filed on October 31, 2007 have been entered. The claims pending in this application are claims 117-180 wherein claims 126, 133, 138, 142, 143, and 149-178 have been withdrawn due to restriction and species election requirements mailed on August 17, 2005. Rejection and/or objection not reiterated from the previous office action are hereby withdrawn in view of the response filed on October 31, 2007. Claims 117-125, 127-132, 134-137, 140, 141, 144-148, 179, and 180 will be examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 148 is objected to because of the following informality: "118-125; 127-132; 134-137; 140-141; and 144-147" should be "118-125, 127-132, 134-137, 140, 141, and 144-147". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. New Matter

Claims 117-125, 127-132, 134-137, 140, 141, 144-148, 179, and 180 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitation “wherein said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced to into the recipient polynucleotide duplex” are added to the newly amended independent claim 117. Since the limitation “wherein said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced to into the recipient polynucleotide duplex” can be read as that said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex of a triplex displacer-recipient complex formed by said displacer and said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced to into the recipient polynucleotide duplex, and page 19, lines 17-24 of specification suggested by applicant does not describe such claim recitation, there are new matters in claim 117.

MPEP 2163.06 notes “IF NEW MATTER IS ADDED TO THE CLAIMS, THE EXAMINER SHOULD REJECT THE CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH - WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT. *IN RE RASMUSSEN*, 650 F.2D 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).” MPEP 2163.02 teaches that “Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed...If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitations, or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application.” MPEP 2163.06 further notes “WHEN AN AMENDMENT IS FILED IN REPLY TO AN OBJECTION OR REJECTION BASED ON 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, A STUDY OF THE ENTIRE APPLICATION IS OFTEN NECESSARY TO DETERMINE WHETHER

Art Unit: 1634

OR NOT "NEW MATTER" IS INVOLVED. *APPLICANT SHOULD THEREFORE SPECIFICALLY POINT OUT THE SUPPORT FOR ANY AMENDMENTS MADE TO THE DISCLOSURE*" (emphasis added).

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 117-125, 127-132, 134-137, 140, 141, 144-148, 179, and 180 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 117 is rejected as vague and indefinite because it is unclear that a displacer-recipient complex is a duplex or triplex. If a displacer-recipient complex is a duplex, a duplex must be formed by the displacer and one of strand of the recipient polynucleotide, "displacer-recipient complex" recited in claim 1 is not a proper term. Please clarify.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 117-119, 121, 125, 134-136, 144, 145, 179, and 180 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al., (US Patent No. 5,214,136, filed on February 20, 1990).

Regarding claim 117, Lin *et al.*, teach a nucleic acid displacer composition comprising

an isolated oligo- or polynucleotide displacer (ie., 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4), said oligo- or polynucleotide displacer comprising two or more sequences: a) at least one first sequence which complexes with said recipient polynucleotide (ie., CCC-TCT in 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4); b) at least one second sequence (ie., TT-TTT in 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4), said second sequence being complementary to at least a portion of one strand of said recipient polynucleotide, comprising one or more modified nucleotides (ie., CP in 3' of 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP) that increase stability; and comprising one or more nucleotides that form a mismatch (ie., T in 6 position in 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4) with said strand of the recipient polynucleotide as recited in the claim (see columns 8-10 and Table 4). Since the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, has an ability to change at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in a recipient polynucleotide duplex which is available in nature when the displacer is introduced to the recipient polynucleotide duplex, the recipient polynucleotide duplex and the displacer-recipient complex recited in the claim are not parts of a nucleic acid displacer composition, and the phrase "wherein said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide" is not a structural limitation of the claim but is a functional limitation of the claim, Lin *et al.*, teach that said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced to the recipient polynucleotide duplex as recited in the claim.

Regarding claims 118, 119, and 121, Lin *et al.*, teach that said second sequence is adjacent to said first sequence as recited in claim 118 wherein said second sequence is separated from said first sequence by from 1 to 5 intervening moieties (ie., T in 6 position in 5'-P-CCC-

Art Unit: 1634

TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4) as recited in claim 119 and said intervening moieties are nucleotides as recited in claim 121 (see columns 8-10 and Table 4).

Regarding claim 125, Lin *et al.*, teach that least one of said nucleotides complementary to said strand of the recipient polynucleotide duplex is modified to increase the stability of the displacer-recipient complex, wherein the modification is in the second sequence (ie., CP in 3' of 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-CCP) (see columns 8-10 and Table 4).

Regarding claims 134-136, since Lin *et al.*, teach that 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-CCP is resistant to snake venom phosphodiesterase digestion, it is known that snake venom phosphodiesterase is an exonuclease (see page 1 of attachment for snake venom phosphodiesterase), and claim 134 does not require that at least one moiety attached to a terminus of the oligo or polynucleotide is different from the one modified nucleotide recited in claim 117, Lin *et al.*, disclose at least one moiety attached to a terminus of the oligo or polynucleotide, said moiety conferring exonuclease resistance to the terminus to which it is attached as recited in claim 134 wherein said moiety is attached to a terminal nucleotide (ie., anthraquinone of P in 3' of 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-CCP) as recited in claim 135 and said moiety is indirectly attached to a terminal nucleotide as recited in claim 136 (ie., by P in 3' of 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-CCP) (see columns 8-10 and Table 4).

Regarding claims 144 and 145, Lin *et al.*, teach further comprising a modification (ie., a fluorescent label) which permits detection of the displacer-recipient complex as recited in claim 144 wherein said modification comprises a member selected from the group consisting of non-radioactive labels, radioactive labels, fluorescent labels, chemiluminescent labels, enzymes and targets for detection as recited in claim 145 (see column 5, lines 51-64).

Regarding claim 179, since the recipient polynucleotide duplex recited in the claim is not a part of a nucleic acid displacer composition and the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, has an ability to changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in a recipient polynucleotide duplex which is available in nature, claim 179 is anticipated by Lin *et al.*.

Regarding claim 180, since the claim does not require that the oligo- or polynucleotide displacer is a duplex, Lin *et al.*, teach that the ligo- or polynucleotide displacer comprises a displacer strand (i.e., CCC-TCT in 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4) and a linker strand (i.e., TTT-TTT-CCP in 5'-P-CCC-TCT-TTT-TTT-CCP in Table 4) as recited in claim 180.

Therefore, Lin *et al.*, teach all limitations recited in claims 117-119, 121, 125, 134-136, 144, 145, 179, and 180.

Response to Arguments

In page 12, first paragraph bridging to page 13, third paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that “[T]he amended claims of the instant application are all drawn to a nucleic acid displacer composition, which comprises an isolated displacer that binds to or complexes with a recipient polynucleotide *duplex* to form a displacer-recipient complex. The displacer-recipient complex forms such that the oligo- or polynucleotide displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex. The ‘displacer’ is not ‘introduced *into* the recipient polynucleotide’ as suggested above. Rather the displacer is introduced *to* the recipient polynucleotide and has characteristics allowing it to form a displacer-recipient complex that leads to displacing an original strand, binding the other one strand, and ultimately changing at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex. These required functional characteristics are specific properties of the

claimed displacer compositions. Lin *et al.* however, provides no indication that the oligomers disclosed therein have any of these characteristics or properties. The oligomers in Lin *et al.* ‘are characterized by their ability to target specific oligonucleotide sequences regardless of the mechanisms of targeting or the mechanism of the effect thereof.’(Col. 6, 11. 18-21). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Lin *et al.* that the disclosed oligomers are able to form a displacer-recipient complex. Nor does Lin *et al.* teach or suggest a nucleic acid molecule that is able to displace one strand in a recipient polynucleotide duplex and bind to the other. Instead, Lin *et al.* discloses that ‘the mechanism by which the specifically-binding oligomers of the invention interfere with or inhibit the activity of a target RNA or DNA is not always established, and is not a part of the invention.’ (Col. 6, 11. 1-5). In fact, the only mention of functional characteristics for oligomers in Lin *et. al.* are binding an mRNA target, forming a triple helix, and interfering with reverse transcription -- none of which necessarily mean strand displacement. (Col. 6, 11.6-17). Lin *et al.* provides no indication to one skilled in the art that the oligomers will have the functional characteristics required in the claims of the instant application”.

These arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection. First, the claims do not require that the displacer is introduced to the recipient polynucleotide and displace an original strand of the recipient polynucleotide as argued by applicant. Second, although Lin *et al.*, do not directly teach changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex, since the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, has an ability to change at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex which is available in nature when the displacer is introduced to the recipient polynucleotide duplex, the recipient polynucleotide duplex and the displacer-

Art Unit: 1634

recipient complex recited in claim 117 are not parts of a nucleic acid displacer composition, and the phrase "wherein said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide duplex" recited in claim 117 is not a structural limitation of the claim but is a functional limitation of the claim, Lin *et al.*, do teach that said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide duplex as recited in the claim. Third, although Lin *et al.* disclose that "the mechanism by which the specifically-binding oligomers of the invention interfere with or inhibit the activity of a target RNA or DNA is not always established, and is not a part of the invention" (column 6, first paragraph), the claims do not require that the oligo-or polynucleotide displacer can inhibit the activity of a target RNA or DNA.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1634

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 146 and 147 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin *et al.*, as applied to claims 117-119, 121, 125, 134-136, 144, 145, 179, and 180 above, and further in view of Dattagupta *et al.*, (US Patent No. 4,737,454, published on April 12, 1988).

The teachings of Lin *et al.*, have been summarized previously, *supra*.

Lin *et al.*, do not disclose that said modification in claim 144 is selected from the group consisting of biotin moieties, phosphorothioate linkages and antigens as recited in claim 146 and a modification which allows capture of the displacer-recipient complex by affinity chromatography as recited in claim 147.

Regarding claims 146 and 147, Since Dattagupta *et al.*, teach that a nucleic acid probe can be labeled with hapten or biotin, an enzyme such as a β -galactosidase or horse radish peroxidase, a fluorescent radical, a phycobiliprotein, a luminescent radical, or a radioisotope (see abstract) and it is known that biotin binds to avidin, Dattagupta *et al.*, disclose that said modification (ie., biotin) in claim 144 is selected from the group consisting of biotin moieties, phosphorothioate linkages and antigens as recited in claim 146 and a modification which allows capture of the displacer-recipient complex by affinity chromatography (ie., the affinity chromatography comprising avidin) as recited in claim 147.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made the displacer recited in claims 146 and 147 wherein said modification is biotin moieties and the modification (ie., biotin) which allows capture of the displacer-recipient complex by affinity chromatography (ie., the affinity chromatography comprising avidin) in view of the prior art of Lin *et al.*, and Dattagupta *et al.*. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because the simple replacement of one kind of label (ie., the fluorescent label taught by Lin *et al.*, see column 5, lines 51-64) from another kind of label (ie., the biotin label taught by Dattagupta *et al.*,) during the process of labeling the displacer recited in claims 146 and 147, in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made since the label taught by Lin *et al.*, and the label taught by Dattagupta *et al.*, are used for the same purpose (ie., labeling a nucleic acid probe).

Furthermore, the motivation to make the substitution cited above arises from the expectation that the prior art elements will perform their expected functions to achieve their expected results when combined for their common known purpose. Support for making the obviousness rejection comes from the M.P.E.P. at 2144.07 and 2144.09.

Also note that there is no invention involved in combining old elements in such a manner that these elements perform in combination the same function as set forth in the prior art without giving unobvious or unexpected results. *In re Rose* 220 F.2d. 459, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Response to Arguments

In page 13, fourth paragraph bridging to page 14, fourth paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that “[N]either Lin *et al.* nor Dattagupta *et al.* teaches or suggests

oligo- or polynucleotides that are able to form a complex with a polynucleotide duplex, resulting in displacement of one strand and binding to the other. Nor is this teaching covered by the Examiner's assertion that 'Lin *et al.* do teach said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide recited in the claim' (Office Action, Pg. 13) While Lin *et al.* teaches a duplex comprising an RNA target and an mutated oligomer, this is not a displacer-recipient complex. Such a complex requires a third component missing in Lin *et al.*: a second strand in the recipient polynucleotide duplex that would be specifically displaced by the oligomer. No such showing is made or suggested in Lin *et al.*".

These arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection. First, although Lin *et al.*, do not directly teach changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex, since the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, has an ability to change at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex which is available in nature when the displacer is introduced to the recipient polynucleotide duplex, the recipient polynucleotide duplex and the displacer-recipient complex recited in claim 117 are not parts of a nucleic acid displacer composition, and the phrase "wherein said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide duplex" recited in claim 117 is not a structural limitation of the claim but is a functional limitation of the claim, Lin *et al.*, do teach that said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide duplex as recited in the claim. Second,

Art Unit: 1634

applicant has no evidence to show that the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, is not able to form a complex with a polynucleotide duplex in nature, resulting in displacement of one strand and binding to the other.

12. Claim 148 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin *et al.*, as applied to claims 117-119, 121, 125, and 134-136 above.

The teachings of Lin *et al.*, have been summarized previously, *supra*.

Lin *et al.*, do not disclose an artificially constructed polynucleotide hybrid comprising a naturally occurring recipient polynucleotide duplex hybridized to the nucleic acid displacer composition of claim 118 as recited in claim 148.

However, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have made an artificially constructed polynucleotide hybrid comprising a naturally occurring recipient polynucleotide duplex hybridized to the nucleic acid displacer composition of claim 118 as recited in claim 148 by hybridizing the nucleic acid displacer composition of claim 118 to a naturally occurring RNA. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because Lin *et al.*, tested the oligonucleotide coupled to anthraquinone *in vitro* and *in vivo* (see column 7, lines 49-51) and hybridized the oligonucleotide coupled to anthraquinone to a single stranded RNA (see column 9) and one having ordinary skill in the art would select a hybridized target nucleic acid such as a naturally occurring RNA based on his or her experimental requirements. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have a reasonable expectation of success to make an artificially constructed polynucleotide hybrid comprising a naturally

Art Unit: 1634

occurring recipient polynucleotide duplex hybridized to the nucleic acid displacer composition of claim 118 as recited in claim 148 by hybridizing the nucleic acid displacer composition of claim 118 to a naturally occurring RNA.

Response to Arguments

In page 14, last paragraph bridging to page 15, third paragraph of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that “[B]ut the resulting complex, as described by the Examiner, would not meet all the limitations required in dependent claim 148, which includes all limitations in base claim 117. As discussed in this response, the nucleic acid displacer composition of claim 117 includes the properties that it displaces one strand in the target *duplex* and binds to the other. No target duplex -- and hence no displacement -- is disclosed in the complex envisaged by the Examiner. This argument also rests on the unfounded premise that such a displacer would change a nucleotide or nucleotide sequence in an RNA strand”.

These arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive toward the withdrawal of the rejection. First, although Lin *et al.*, do not directly teach changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex, since the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, has an ability to change at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in the recipient polynucleotide duplex which is available in nature when the displacer is introduced to the recipient polynucleotide duplex, the recipient polynucleotide duplex and the displacer-recipient complex recited in claim 117 are not parts of a nucleic acid displacer composition, and the phrase “wherein said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide duplex” recited in claim 117 is not a structural limitation of the

Art Unit: 1634

claim but is a functional limitation of the claim, Lin *et al.*, do teach that said displacer changes at least one nucleotide or a nucleotide sequence in said recipient polynucleotide duplex when the displacer is introduced into the recipient polynucleotide duplex as recited in the claim. Second, applicant has no evidence to show that the nucleic acid displacer taught by Lin *et al.*, is not able to form a complex with a polynucleotide duplex in nature, resulting in displacement of one strand and binding to the other.

Conclusion

13. No claim is allowed.
14. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CAR § 1.6(d)). The CM Fax Center number is (571)273-8300.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frank Lu, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571)272-0746. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571)272-0735.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

February 1, 2007

Frank Lu
FRANK LU
PRIMARY EXAMINER